

NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER, AND PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.

DEVOTED TO THE DOCTRINE OF UNIVERSAL BENEVOLENCE AND MISCELLANY OF CHASTE AND MORAL TENDENCY.

"HOW BEAUTIFUL UPON THE MOUNTAINS, ARE THE FEET OF HIM THAT BRINGETH GOOD TIDINGS, THAT PUBLISHETH PEACE."—Isa. lii. 7.

VOL. IV.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1835.

NO. 16.

PUBLISHED SIMULTANEOUSLY IN NEW-YORK AND PHILADELPHIA, AND EDITED BY

T. J. Sawyer, A. C. Thomas, and P. Price.

P. PRICE, Publisher and Proprietor.

TERMS—Two dollars per ann. in advance, or \$2.50 not paid within six months. Publishing offices No. 2 Market-Building, Chatham-Square, (foot of the Bowery) New-York, and No. 132 Chesnut-street, Philadelphia. Letters to be addressed, (post paid) "P. Price, No. 2 Chatham-Square, New-York."

[From the Philadelphian, of January 27.]

FORGIVENESS OF SIN.

Mr. S. W. F. publishes to the world, that Universalists of his class do believe in the *forgiveness of sins*, and that all who assert the contrary, misrepresent them. At the same time, and in the same short piece he says,

"We assert in substance, that 'every sinner receives in this life the full penalty of his transgressions,' and we do it on the authority of the Bible. It is therein said—'But he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he has done; and there is no respect of persons,' Col. iii. 25. 'Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth: much more the wicked and the sinner,' Prov. xi. 31. Such is a portion of holy writ upon which we make the assertion; and we call upon the Dr. to acknowledge its truth, or explicitly deny the obvious sense of the above cited passages.

But the Dr. will still be in the dark, unless we can induce him to review his assertions, and observe that he entirely *confounds* sin with punishment. Let him know, then, that Universalists, who read the Bible, know, that sin and the penalty due to sin are widely different matters; and though the Bible teaches the forgiveness of *sins*, it no where even speaks of the forgiveness of deserved *punishment*. Dr., do you now understand us?"

We can distinguish between *sin*, which is the transgression of the law; and the *penalty due to sin*, which is the penal evil which it is equitable to inflict on account of the commission of sin upon the guilty free agent. But we confess we know nothing of the *forgiveness of sin*, which is not the release of the sinner from the *penalty due*. To talk of *forgiving sin*, without *remitting the penalty due to it*, is nonsense. If a man is punished in full for all his sins, then none of his sins are forgiven. To punish a man for the sin of murder by hanging him, and then forgive his sin of murder would be a ludicrous sort of forgiveness. In the Bible, in civil law, and every where but in the modern dialect of a new sort of Universalists the forgiveness of sin means the release of the culprit from suffering the merited punishment of his sins, either wholly or in part; and just so far as any criminal has suffered the penalty of his crimes he cannot experience forgiveness at all.

We deny that every sinner receives in this life the full penalty of his sins. No passages in the Bible prove any such doctrine. Sooner or later, in the sinner himself or in the Saviour provided for him, all sins will appear in the

righteous judgment of God to meet with merited punishment; and did not the gospel teach us how God has laid on Jesus Christ the iniquity of us all who shall be saved, so that he has borne the punishment of our sins, we should be obliged to conclude that all sinners would forever continue to be treated according to their ill-deserts, and so be everlastingly damned. No penalty, we allow, will be remitted to any sinner but in consideration of Christ's having suffered for him, and in his stead, a full, equivalent, penal infliction of pain. As a general rule, and to a great extent, *the righteous is recompensed in the earth*, or wisdom's ways in general are pleasantness, however, they sometimes bring on men great evils in this life; but the wicked to a much greater extent is recompensed in this life for his wickedness. Vice more uniformly brings misery here than virtue brings with it a suitable reward. Hence it is said, *much more* shall the wicked and the sinner *be recompensed in the earth*. Now if both the righteous and the wicked were *perfectly* recompensed in the earth for their good and evil deeds, it could not with truth be said that the wicked should *much more* than the righteous be recompensed.

He that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done, if he does not repent, and experience pardon. This is the contingency which is connected in the Bible, with every divine threatening of punishment; for thus saith Jehovah, "when I say unto the wicked, thou shalt surely die; if he turn from his sin, and do that which is lawful and right—he shall surely live; he shall not die. None of his sins that he hath committed shall be mentioned unto him," Ezek. xxxiii. 14–16. "If we confess our sins he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins," 1 John i. 9.

To speak of the *forgiveness of punishment* would be an unnatural expression, because the remission of punishment is itself forgiveness: but the forgiveness of sins which does not consist in delivering a sinner from the penalty due to his crimes would be no forgiveness for which we could thank God or man.

Reply.

Dr. Ely says above, that "to talk of forgiving sin, without remitting the penalty due to it, is nonsense." Solomon, in his sublime prayer at the dedication of the Temple, talks as follows:—"Then hear thou from heaven thy dwelling-place, and forgive, and render unto every man according unto all his ways, whose heart thou knowest; (for thou only knowest the hearts of the children of men;) that they may fear thee, to walk in thy ways so long as they live in the land which thou gavest unto our fathers," 2 Chron. vi. 30, 31. This I suppose, Dr. Ely would call talking nonsense, because Solomon speaks of *forgiving sin*, and at the same of *rendering* unto every man according unto all his ways.

The Psalmist says, "thou answeredst them, O Lord our God; thou wast a God that forgavest them, tho' thou tookest vengeance of their inventions," Ps. xcix. 8. So it seems, Solo-

mon, and the Psalmist, both talk nonsense to Dr. Ely's understanding. Their talk to him *is*, as the preaching of Christ crucified *was*, to the Greeks—foolishness, or nonsense.

The case of the murderer, which the Dr. supposes, may be illustrated in the following manner:—Dr. Ely believes that the sin of murder may be forgiven, on condition that the criminal sincerely repents toward God, and properly believes on the Lord Jesus Christ. The Dr. will not deny that he believes this. According to his views, then, a man murders, is detected, tried, and condemned to suffer the penalty due for the sin of murder, which is that he shall be hung. He repents, and God forgives him the penalty due for his sin; for Dr. Ely says, "just so far as he suffers the penalty of his crime he cannot experience forgiveness at all;" and he farther says, "no penalty will be remitted to any sinner but in consideration of Christ's having suffered for him, and in his stead, a full, equivalent, penal infliction of pain." So the penitent and believing murderer has his punishment viz. hanging, remitted on this consideration, that Christ suffered for him and in his stead. Yet "the powers that be" proceed to hang the culprit. Then the case stands thus—the murderer is forgiven his sin by having the penalty due for it remitted; yet he suffers that penalty by being hung—and hence can experience no forgiveness for his sin, Jesus "suffers for him, and in his stead, a full, equivalent, penal infliction of pain," and the penalty for the sin of murder, hanging, is remitted to the criminal in consideration thereof. Reader, this is Dr. Ely's "*dialect*!" Is not this "a ludicrous sort of forgiveness?"

The modern dialect of Universalists, in the expression of their religious views, is copied from the Bible, and no marvel that it appears nonsensical and ludicrous to Dr. Ely. Were we to adopt the dialect of the Genevan Reformer, or that of the New-Light or Old-Light Presbyterians, our language would not make his "ears tingle." But whether the dialect suits him or not, we prefer it to that of any vocabulary invented by the craft or cunning of men. We hope, ere long, to satisfy the Dr., that God has chosen the foolish things of this world—those who talk such "*nonsense*" as they find in the Bible, to confound the wise.

Dr. Ely allows, that "as a general rule, and to a great extent, the righteous is recompensed in the earth;" and he also allows, that "the wicked to a much greater extent is recompensed in this life for his wickedness." Now it appears to me, that if, as a general rule and to a great extent, the one is recompensed in the earth, it will not require more than a much greater extent "*perfectly*" to recompense the other in this life! Dr., can you prove by the Bible, that the wicked and the sinner shall, to a "*much greater extent*," be recompensed in another life, for their sins committed in this life? You have an opportunity of so doing with your correspondent, Br. Thomas. I like to see you try to do it.

Dr. Ely says, "He that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done, if he does not repent and experience pardon." Paul used a different dialect. He says, "He that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done; and there is no respect of persons." "Stop," says Dr. Ely, "that is the modern dialect of a new sort of Universalists.—The persons of those who repent *will be respected*—the penalty due to them will be remitted—they will not receive according to the wrong which they have done." Reader, I prefer the "dialect" of Paul, though Dr. Ely may call it "nonsense."

The Dr. cites Ezek. xxxiii, 14, 16, to prove that deserved punishment shall be remitted.—No such thing is found in the passage, however. The text says, "none of his sins that he hath committed shall be mentioned unto him." It says not one word about remitting the *penalty* due for sins. We are told, "the wages of sin is death." This agrees with what Ezek. says.—So long as a man earns his wages, he ought to receive them. So long as a man serves sin, he should have the wages thereof, which is death. But certainly, we do not expect to pay a man wages after he ceases to labor for us, and goes into the employment of another. It is perfectly plain, then, according to the Bible, that so long as a man serves sin, he shall receive the wages thereof, which is death; and it is equally plain from the same source, that when a man forsakes sin, and serves righteousness, he shall no longer receive the wages of iniquity, but from the commencement of his righteousness he shall receive the wages thereof, which is life and peace. Dr. I am anxious that you should understand me. There is just as much difference between *sin*, and the *punishment* of sin, as there is between the *labor* of the workman and his *wages*. Would it not be "*ludicrous*" for you to talk about *forgiving* a man his wages, who had been laboring for you? And should you pay the wages of those you employ to your own son, as a substitute of the laborers, who, think, would work for you?

Suppose you were entitled to the constant service of a man, as God is ever entitled to our service—suppose he should leave the service of Dr. Ely, and go into the service of a man, whom we will call Sin. Suppose you were to say to him—Sir, I am your rightful owner; I demand your service—I require you immediately to leave the service of Mr. Sin, and come and serve me.—The wages of Mr. Sin, is death. If you serve him, you will or shall receive his wages, so long as you serve him. Suppose he continues in the service of Sin for a certain time—suppose Mr. Sin punctually pays him his wages—*Sin never sleeps with the wages of a hireling*. Suppose, however, you call upon him again, and entreat him to forsake Mr. Sin, and return home to you—suppose as an inducement for him to leave Sin, you assure him, that on condition, that he will forsake your enemy, Mr. Sin, and serve you, you will blot out all his evil deeds, done in the service of Sin—that you will not remember them, nor mention them unto him—that you pardon or forgive him all his acts against you, while he was in evil service—that you will treat him and pay him the wages of righteousness, just as if he had never left your service at all. Suppose he were to comply with your request, and you were to treat him as you promised—would you have forgiven him the wages of Sin? No. He would have received his wages of his employer, before he left his service. So when "All the ends of the earth shall remember and turn unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall come and worship before him," Ps. xxii, 27, then sin shall have no servants, but God shall receive the service and the homage of every heart. Dr. if you do not now understand me, and perceive that I believe the doctrine of the

Bible precisely, propose your difficulties, and I will try again.

Philadelp'ia.

original.

THE CONTRAST—No. 4.

We speak that we do know; and testify that we have seen, John, iii, 11.

I have trembled, when I have heard from the lips of the professed ambassador of Jesus, "haste, oh haste to repent for you may lie down to night on your pillow and awake in hell." When the awful words, wrath, pit, outer darkness, wailings, torment, confusion, and eternal death, sounded on my ear, "rotteness entered into my bones, and I trembled in myself that I might rest in the day of trouble." These words carried home to my agitated heart the *truth* (as it was called) that there is a dreadful hell for the unbeliever and the impenitent. In the silent calmness of midnight, while all nature was hushed in repose, "while not a leaf had leave to stir," and friends were locked in balmy sleep around me, sleep fled from my eyes, and "slumber came not near my eyelids," for the horrors of the deep bottomless abyss haunted my soul. "I found sorrow and trouble." It were vain to attempt a description of my feelings: with David I could say, "horror overwhelmed me."

When the morning came, bringing its returning joys, I yet was sad, fearful, unhappy. "The heaven's above me were as brass, and the earth under my feet as Iron." A frowning, angry God sat in the cloud over my head ready to hurl from the everlasting seat of offended justice a thunder-bolt to seal my endless ruin. Time passed along, and I thought that I had obtained a hope; the vials of wrath were exchanged for those of mercy; "the lightnings laid aside their fiery bolts, and the billows ceased to roll." But while I had escaped myself from this dread calamity, the glittering sword of Divine justice was still brandished over the head of a devoted father, and a beloved mother. I was not happy yet. I had not "entered into rest because of unbelief."

Blessed be God that I have "met with a change." He has not changed. He is the same gracious Father, the same faithful Benefactor that He was when I madly distrusted His mercy and goodness. True, I now read of anger, wrath, hell, &c. in the word of truth, but they have a scriptural and significant meaning, and they harmonize with other parts of the sacred record without affixing to them the idea of an inexorable judge, a vindictive avenger of sin, and the place of unmitigated torments, where fiends forever howl, and wailing spirits blaspheme God and curse the day of their being.

I have seen the young, the amiable female, the "dangerous moral" young man, cower under the preaching of "hell-torments." Screams for mercy rent the air; loud cries for deliverance from the ceaseless wrath of an incensed God, and the deep damnation of hell, drew forth the spontaneous sympathetic tear from my own eyes. They were called on in a voice of thunder to believe on Jesus Christ and love their Creator, lest the lowering clouds gathering in a storm of Divine vengeance should burst over their heads and blast their souls forever. Now let us *Contrast* the reasons here given why we should have faith, with those which the blessed Teacher gave. Did he urge any to believe, on pain of endless torments? He says, "*believe me for my work's sake*"—not because you may escape endless perdition; no such thing is mentioned. Again, we read, John, ii, 23, "Now when he was in Jerusalem at the passover in the feast day, many believed in his name." Why? because he threatened them with hell? No. "When they saw the miracles which he did." See also Acts xviii, 8, where we are told that Crispus and all his house with many of the Corinthians

believed on Jesus. There is no mention made of hell, their exposure to it, or their groanings of fear on account of it. Oh! that we could have more evangelical preaching such as would assimilate nearer to Christ's preaching, and to that of Paul, who, while he "ceased not to declare the whole counsel of God," said nothing of the flames of an "eternal hell." B. B. H.

Original.

A UNIVERSALIST PRAYER.

After this manner therefore pray ye: "Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name, Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen."

It is believed that very few *limitarians* are fully aware of the true import and bearing of this prayer, or else knowingly act contrary to the principles therein inculcated. It was, as all who read the Bible know, offered up by our Savior as a pattern for the erring children of men, and is adapted to the universal condition of mankind. Is there any thing like *partialism* exhibited in this prayer? Is it not a *universal* prayer in every sense of the term? If the now popular doctrine of "free agency," on the part of the creature, to choose or refuse eternal life had been taught by our Savior when on earth, he certainly would have framed a prayer better to coincide with his doctrine than the above. He would have prayed for the will of *man* to be done, on earth at least, because his doctrine would have destroyed the will of God here. He would have thanked the Father for the power given to man to thwart His own will and deliver themselves from evil temptations, and would have claimed the "*glory*" for *man*, for working out and *meriting* his own future eternal happiness. But thank God this was not his prayer. He commences with the unlimited expression of "*Our Father*;" there is no limits given. He is the Father of all mankind. "*Thy kingdom come*," not if we choose to have it come. "*Thy will be done*," not if we choose to have it done. What is *His* will? "*God will have ALL men to be saved*." Man has no will nor agency in the matter, nor can have none in relation to his future destiny. "And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil," not give us the power to deliver ourselves, but *Thou* deliver us. And why are we to call upon God to do all for us? The reason is gloriously given in the close of the prayer—"*For thine is the kingdom, power, and glory, for ever. Amen*!"

This prayer, is also equally inappropriate to the professed belief of the Calvinist. Why should the Calvinist pray against temptation, or for deliverance from evil, if it was decreed from all eternity just how many, and who should finally be delivered, and all the rest of mankind doomed to be tempted beyond the possibility of deliverance? Who then will dare to limit the *universal goodness* of God, or call Him a partial Being. When the first and only form of prayer that Christ ever taught to his disciples, breathes forth in such emphatic language His *universal goodness and power*, and teaches that it is His guardian care that guides all our actions, and is able in His own good time to deliver us all from evil temptations and all their blighting influences. After the "*manner*" of Christ therefore pray ye.

Limitarians do not appear to consider that this prayer which they so often repeat, is in direct opposition to the doctrine they preach.—But, is not the claiming to be the origin, means, and ultimate accomplishment of our own eternal salvation, endeavoring to diminish the "power" and "glory" of God, and rob Him of the "honor" of triumphantly establishing his "kingdom" throughout the whole earth? And is not this the direct bearing of "free agency?"

Would our Lord, whom St. Paul declares, "tasted death for every man," have given us, for a pattern, a prayer which required us to give *God glory* for sending us, or the greater part of those whom he died to save, to an endless hell hereafter?

O fools! that say *we* have Abraham to our father! Is not God the father of us all, believer, or unbeliever, saint or sinner? We are all the children of one God, and are consequently included in the promise made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. And I trust the day is not far distant when men, instead of making long prayers, full of vain speeches, to get glory of men, will adopt *understandingly*, and with sincerity the mild, simple, and universal prayer of our Savior. And instead of claiming eternal life on the ground of *merit*, will look for it as the free unmerited gift of God, who has assured us in his holy word, that he will do all things according to his own *will and pleasure*.

Philadelphia, Jan. 9, 1835. I. M. C.

Original.

OUR BELIEF—No. 5.

For I am the, Lord, I change not, Mal. iii, v.

We believe that the Supreme Being is absolutely *immutable*. And we mean by this expression that his will, purposes and pleasure, and all that appertains to him, are *always the same*. The very notion of a God carries with it the idea of perfect unchangability. The Creator and Governor of all things, "of whom, and through whom, and to whom are all things," Rom. ii, 36, is above the possibility of mutation; and cannot be operated upon by any cause whatsoever. If he were susceptible of undergoing one *real change*, either of disposition or of design, he might continue successively to mutate from one character to another, ad infinitum. Because, he, being "above all, and through all, and in all," Ephes. iv, 6, it follows that no being or power could secure to him a nature that is "without variability, or even the shadow of turning." James i, 17.

The greatest errors in theology that now prevail in the christian world, may be traced to their origin in the supposition that the Supreme Being is alternately *pleased* and *displeased* with his creatures; and that the voluntary conduct of man may produce in him an actual change of feeling! It is probable that no professing Christian would be willing to subscribe to this opinion, *as we have stated it*; nevertheless, *the opinion itself* is the legitimate parent of the principal mistakes into which modern theologians have inadvertently fallen. And we may expect the advocates of the *chance system* to swarm in the earth so long as this Proteus of error is permitted to exist. For, when an individual has received the opinion to which we refer, as the principal ingredient of his faith, he is almost inaccessible to the power of reason and sound argument.

When the Scripture writers speak of the *anger, wrath, jealousy*, etc. of God, we believe they use these terms in a *qualified sense*; and that without the necessary qualification, they cannot in truth be applied to the immutable Jehovah. In Rom. iii, 5, St. Paul propounds this important query: "Is God unrighteous who taketh vengeance?" and immediately adds, "I speak as a man." He spoke as a man—was addressing men—and used familiar language. He did not mean that there is *real vengeance* in that Being whose nature is love, and who changes not; but merely that God exercises justice. This passage alone seems quite sufficient to teach us what is meant by the *vengeance and anger* of God. All that we understand then by the anger of the Almighty is any dispensation of his providence which *appears to us* as a manifestation of wrath. And believing him to be absolutely immutable, we cannot avoid the belief that he

is always actuated by the same feeling, and always has in view the same benevolent *end*, in all his dealings with his creature, man. The very same feeling that prompted the destruction from the earth of the Antediluvians, moved "the Father of spirits, to send the Son of his love" to be the propitiation for the sins of the whole world." With Him, love moves—love directs—and love will consummate the whole scheme of Divine government in glory at last! "The Lord reigneth; let the earth rejoice."

New-London, Ct.

A. M.

Original.

REPORT CONTRADICTED.

Br. Whittemore in the *Trumpet* informs his readers that there is a report in circulation in Stukely, L. C. which originated from a letter sent to that place from Albany, N. Y. that Br. Le Fevre held a discussion last fall in Albany, with a Methodist minister—that the Methodist *run him out, put him down* and caused him to confess his errors and he became converted to the doctrine of endless misery. Br. Whittemore then desires to hear whether there is any foundation for this story.

It is very well known to Br. Whittemore that I am diligently occupied in the avocation of a Universalist minister in the city of New-York—a station I should not be very desirous of occupying if I entertained any sentiments at variance with the doctrine of universal salvation. This I consider a sufficient contradiction to the report of my being a convert to the belief of endless misery.

The other features of the report are equally false. I never had a controversy with a Methodist minister or any other in the city of Albany.—I have controverted the great question, whether the doctrine of endless misery was taught in the Scriptures, with clergymen of different denominations in various parts of the State, but never in Albany. I can safely say in reference to all such discussions that the result so far from convincing me that my present views were erroneous, only tended to strengthen them. The whole of the report is therefore a fabrication and unquestionably of Cretian origin. See Titus i, 12.

But it may be a matter of justice to exonerate the person at Stukely, whoever he may be, from any share in the *fabrication*. While I ministered to the Society in Troy, there was a revival in one of the Presbyterian churches in Albany and the officiating clergyman informed the congregation that I had renounced Universalism. This was evidently done for *effect*. The assertion coming from "spiritual wickedness in high places" and having gained a large share of public credence, it was deemed expedient to arrest its farther progress and accordingly one of my friends belonging to the Universalist church in Albany, contradicted it, in the secular daily paper of that city. There appears to me to be much heathenism in the *practice* of some professors of religion as well as in their *creed*. Ovid in his poem on "the art of love," advances the sentiment, "that all is fair in love"—and some fanatics adopt the same opinion and practice on the same principle "all is fair in promoting our orthodoxy."

It is possible the person who circulated the report at Stukely may have received his intelligence from some hearer who attended the Presbyterian church in Albany and never became acquainted with the fact of its having been contradicted. This is the only way in which I can account for the currency of this strange story unless I should hazard the conjecture, that there is a *revival going on at Stukely*. If this is the case, there is no necessity in seeking for foreign parentage.

I have perhaps given this subject more attention than it really merits. There is however

one circumstance which may redeem it from the charge of superfluity. Stukely is not far from the parish in which I was located when in the Episcopal church. I have sometimes preached there and am well known in that neighborhood. By this communication I would wish my Episcopal friends to understand that I did not leave the church *hastily*, without duly considering the step which I was taking and carefully weighing the arguments which induced it; and I would assure my Universalist friends (if I have any there,) that my faith in the illimitable grace of God, receives every day new accessions of strength.

C. F. L. F.

A NEW FIELD.

A letter from a new subscriber in Ulster co. says that our paper forwarded there for him "is the first Universalist print, (excepting the Bible,) which has ever appeared in that town." His packages are all broken open, and the papers bear the marks of having been read pretty thoroughly. Universalists there, he says, are represented by the clergy as the offscourings of the earth, as a pack of infidels, who believe in neither God, angel or spirit, and with whom it is dangerous to converse. Our correspondent need not be alarmed—this is their usual treatment of Universalists. And neither will he long remain alone. Such misrepresentation and abuse will speedily lead the community to examine into Universalism, and few will reject it, when they once know it. P.

BOSTON YOUNG MEN'S INSTITUTE.

We are gratified to learn by the *Trumpet* that a Young Men's Universalist Institute has just been organized in Boston under very favorable auspices. We agree with Br. Whittemore, as also Br. Adams of the N. H. Star, that "there ought to be" a similar institution in New-York, and we had flattered ourselves that there would be one, (we expected it ere this,) but it "is not" yet. We feel, however, that there is some little excuse for us here, just now, (and we doubt not our friends will so regard it,) as a Bible class has just been organized by Br. Sawyer, which meets once a week. A Society, which promises much usefulness, has also just been formed for the purpose of promoting Universalism in this city. This Society meets monthly, and its Board of Directors weekly, which of course occupies considerable time with our friends.—Under all these circumstances it has been thought by some, impolitic to multiply meetings, or objects, at the present time. And it is perhaps as well that it should be so, just now. Though we have not got an Institute started, Brs. W. and A. and our friends generally, may rest assured that we are by no means idle, and we hope ere long to be able to give a good account of ourselves. P.

THE TRIUMPH OF TRUTH.

We have just issued from the Press in Pamphlet form, an edition of the interesting Tale, "Triumph of Truth," by Mrs. S. A. DOWNER, which was inserted in No. 10 of the present vol. of the Messenger. We hope friends will order them liberally, (as they have done, and are still doing, the "Sacrifice," inserted in No. 1 of this vol.) and thereby aid us in giving them an extensive circulation. We put them low for this very purpose. Many people will read these pamphlets when they will not read any thing else on the subject. Every family should be furnished with something of the pamphlet kind in defence of our sentiments, as an exchange for the floods of orthodox Tracts that are poured in upon them. We put the Pamphlet at \$2, 50 per 100 or 37 1-2 cts. per dozen.

ORIGINAL ESSAY—NO. VI.

Read before the Philadelphia "Young Men's Universalist Institute."

"Let not your hearts be troubled."

This is the beautiful and impressive language of him who came into the world to save sinners; to bring about the great and good designs of the Almighty Creator of heaven and earth. It is the language of love "that love which passeth knowledge;" which was the great principle manifested by Christ while dwelling amidst the storms, the troubles and trials of earth. The love of Christ was so great, that when he beheld the miserable condition of mankind, his heart burned with pity. He sought the most effectual means by which he might mitigate their sufferings, and, as he moved onward in his glorious career, the fruits of his labour followed his footsteps. He went about doing good; opening the eyes of the blind; making the deaf to hear, the lame to walk, and the maimed to be whole.

To those who received his sayings, "he was a lamp to their feet, and a light to their path." The Prophet speaking of him in the language of God, says: "I will put my spirit upon him; he shall show forth judgment unto the Gentiles. He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench; he shall bring forth judgment unto truth. I will give thee for a covenant of the People, for a light of the Gentiles. To open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from prison, and them that sit in darkness out of their prison-house." Isa. xlii, 1, 2, 3, 6, 7. "The people which sat in darkness saw a great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death, light is sprung up." Matt. iv, 16. Here is the glorious light of the Gospel shining into the benighted minds of those "who knew not God, and obeyed not his commandments." It has opened the eyes of their mind, which was closed by the mist of ignorance, and enables them to see, and "walk in its light," and embrace it as it was revealed to them—"Glad tidings of great joy."—Those who received it, found that joy, happiness, and peace of mind, which the world with all its delusive charms could never give. This was the teaching of "Jesus of Nazareth;" he comforted those who mourned, and poured the oil of consolation into the bereaved bosom.

That spirit of love which pervaded his bosom, speaking emphatically in word and deed, "let not your hearts be troubled," was freely offered unto all. He taught them "to love one another, as he loved them;" "to return good for evil;" "to love their enemies," and to "pray for their persecutors." He presented himself as the door of his "Father's kingdom"—"I am the door; by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and go in and out and find pasture." Again: "I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd giveth his life for his sheep." St. John, x, 9, 11. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. I have called you friends, for all things that I have heard of my father, I have made known unto you." xv, 13, 15. Here is ample testimony of the love of Christ, which makes us "co-workers in the Gospel, fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God;" which rends asunder the shackles of slavery, and enables us to "stand fast in the glorious liberty wherewith Christ has made us free;" of that love which first whispered to us "let not your hearts be troubled;" of that love which dispels the clouds of ignorance and superstition from our minds, and admits the cheering rays of the Gospel, enabling us to look with singleness of heart unto God, "who is the giver of every good and perfect gift." In whom also there is no variableness; who is the same "yesterday, to-day, and forever;" and having faith in his goodness, purity and love, "we know that if our earthly house of this taber-

nacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." 2 Cor. v, 1. Then let us, if we would have the "comforter, which is the spirit of truth dwelling in our hearts," be "followers of God, as dear children; and walk in love, as Christ has loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering, and a sacrifice unto God for a sweet smelling savour." Eph. v, 1, 2.

Need more be given to testify the abounding love of Christ the Lord? Was it love which prompted him to weep over Jerusalem? Was it love which caused him to restore to the arms of parents, and friends, those who were wrapt in the cold embrace of death; to restore to health, those who were afflicted with divers diseases? Was it love which prompted him to open the way of life, and redeem mankind from sin and death? Was it love which prompted him to comfort his disciples in the words of the text, "Let not your hearts be troubled;" which caused him to say, "fear not it is I!" Was it love which led him to Calvary's mount to lay down his life for us? If love led him to this, his mission could be nothing more nor less than a *mission of love*; and if such it was, why blind the minds of mortals, that they may not behold it, "as it is in Christ Jesus the Lord." "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved." St. John, iii, 16, 17. Can more be required to testify the love of Christ? If so, "Search the scriptures;" which will give sufficient testimony of him, and show by what spirit he was led onward in the great work of salvation; which will reveal the cause of his crying, "Father forgive them, they know not what they do;" which will tell, why he exclaimed when yielding up the ghost—"It is finished!"

Knowing that the gospel of Christ abounds in love, let us, as Universalists, notwithstanding the revilings and bitterness of our enemies, though we be oppressed on all sides, rest assured that we are suffering for the Lord; that Christ suffered the same for us; that he was encompassed by enemies; that he was hated, and spit upon; still he went on accomplishing the great work of righteousness, and at last exclaimed, "It is finished—the work is done—mankind are redeemed from bondage." Then let us serve the Lord not as a revengeful being, but as a God of love, of infinite goodness and truth. And relying upon his justice, rest satisfied that he will not leave his work undone; but that which he designed in the beginning will be accomplished; feeling assured that as he never destined mankind to endless misery, he will when we finish our pilgrimage on earth, take us to himself, where we will sing—"Hosanna to God," where there will be no more weeping, where "sorrow, and sighing shall flee away; where all tears shall be wiped from our eyes; where the wicked cease from troubling, and where the weary are at rest."—Amen. J. W.

[The following article is from the Maine Free Press.—There is much truth in it, and we wish it might be attentively read. The maxim that "worth makes the man," has indeed gone out of vogue, to a lamentable degree.—The unprincipled possessing their "gay exterior" and "winning ways," are quite too frequently received into confidence, to the utter exclusion of moral worth, and thus a premium is in reality bid up to the vicious. How long shall such a reproach rest upon us?]

"BUT HE IS A GENTLEMAN."

Not long since we chanced to hear a short dialogue between a mother and her daughter, who had just arrived at the age of "sweet sixteen," on the propriety of associating with a certain individual who was not named, but whom the mother seemed anxious that her

daughter should shun. From what we could learn from the conversation, it seemed that the individual in question possessed a prepossessing exterior—dressed well—was familiar and affable in his manners, had managed to keep up his head in what is generally termed "good society," in consequence of his "winning ways," but who was, nevertheless, a heartless, depraved wretch—a debauchee, and a notorious gambler. It was after these qualities of the man had been portrayed by the anxious mother, as a warning to the inexperienced daughter, that the artless girl exclaimed, as though she had hit upon a reason that more than outweighed all her mother's objections—"But he is a gentleman!"

These words struck our mind forcibly, nor will the honest simplicity with which they were uttered be soon effaced. "But he is a gentleman!" What then? Why these cannot be vices—a gentleman would not practice any thing that is not proper, is undoubtedly the conclusion to which the unsophisticated mind of this girl at once arrived. How much misery, how much disappointment, how much overwhelming sorrow and regret has this one short sentence caused in the world. How many heartless villains are there who move in the first circles, and whose characters are known to be infamous, and who yet hold up their heads for no other reason than because they are gentlemen—that is to say, they possess the exterior of gentlemen; a comely person, affable manners, and a good suit of clothes. How few are there who look beyond those accomplishments in forming their estimate of character. Let a man be ever so corrupt, let his private character be what it may, if he only possesses the little external accomplishments, it will not answer, under the present constitution of society, to censure him, for "he is a gentleman." But let a female wander from the path of virtue and propriety—yes, let her even be suspected, though she may be ever so charming, this grand salvo, "But she is a lady," will not be sufficient to cover her failing. Such a certificate will not sustain her—she must be consigned to disgrace and infamy. In what consists the difference? Why is it that men may practice with impunity vices which will not be for a moment tolerated in the other sex. That there is a false standard of gentility set up in society there can be no doubt. The good old maxim of Pope's that "worth makes the man," has gone out of vogue, at least with a very large portion of society; or else a different standard of worth has been set up, which is to measure a man's worth by the quality of cloth he wears, or the grace with which he bows.

Thus it is no uncommon thing, to see a man, who can drink, gamble, and swear, and commit any other species of vice, and still be a "gentleman." If these men could be stripped of their false plumage, if their real characters could be exhibited in their naked deformity to the artless youth, there would be little danger to be apprehended from them. But the cloak under which their baseness is disguised renders them doubly dangerous associates for youth; for it enables them, first, to gain confidence by their easy address, then to lure them to ruin. Every parent who has the good of his offspring at heart, should not hesitate to expose the vipers, nor let the consideration that "he is a gentleman" have any weight in restraining him from withdrawing his children from the society and influence of such men. It may be an unpleasant task, but it is a duty which you owe to your children, and to yourself, and will doubtless save you many a pang of anguish, and many a vain regret.

There is scarce any thing more disagreeable and offensive to me, than the common indolence of mankind about religion and truth in general.—Dr. Lardner.

MESSENGER & UNIVERSALIST.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1835.

ORCHARD-ST. CHURCH.

A Funeral Discourse will be delivered in this Church on Sunday (to-morrow) evening, on the occasion of the death of Thaddeus Seymour, Esq. Services to commence at 7 o'clock.

GREENWICH CHURCH.

Subject for Sunday, (to-morrow) Evening, 1 John v, 10, 11.

BR. A. C. THOMAS

Will preach in Newark, N. J. on Wednesday and Thursday evenings, Feb. 18th and 19th, on his way from Philadelphia to New-York. He will preach in the Orchard-St. Church, in the morning, and at the Greenwich Church in the afternoon and evening of Sunday, Feb. 22. He will also preach on Monday and Tuesday evenings, 23d and 24th, but notice of the places will be given from the respective desks.

THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION.

[From the Philadelphian of Feb. 5, 1835]
To Mr. Abel C. Thomas.—Letter 15.

Philadelphia, Jan. 15th,* 1835.

Dear Sir—I never pray for the salvation of those whom I believe to have entered the state of the miserable in the world of spirits; nor the pardon of those who have committed the unpardonable sin; because the Spirit of inspiration teaches us not to pray for such persons. I have never prayed that *Universalism* may prove true, for that, in my esteem, would be praying that a most pernicious *false* system might prove true. In submission to the will of God, I pray for the conversion, and thereby the salvation of all men who are yet prisoners of hope: and I doubt not that the time will come, when for a thousand years, true piety will be as extensively spread through the wide world as irreligion and false religion have been.

I have never said that nothing but one expression or clause of scripture prevents me from becoming a Universalist; for the Bible seems to me from beginning to end to be full of the doctrine of the future, interminable punishment of a multitude of impenitent, unpardoned sinners. If, however, I could be persuaded that any one passage of the Bible was intended by the Holy Spirit to teach the doctrine of the future salvation and happiness of all mankind, I must admit the doctrine and construe all other passages of the Bible in consistency with it, or reject the whole. In like manner, if convinced, as I am most clearly, that any one passage of the sacred oracles teaches the everlasting punishment of some of the human family, I must construe all the other parts of the divinely inspired volume in consistency with that doctrine, or reject the only infallible rule of faith and practice.

That you, sir, are not at all likely to give up your only hope of future blessedness, founded in the belief that all mankind will be rendered happy, merely by being raised from the dead and rendered immortal, I am constrained, reluctantly to believe.

The language in which I teach the doctrine of endless misery as the portion of some after the resurrection of the dead is the very language of the Bible; and yet you believe it not; but ascribe to every plain assertion of future misery some far-fetched, inconsistent, or absurd meaning. The coming of the Son of man, to gather all nations before him and then divide the righteous from the wicked, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats, when about to fold them for the night, with you is something already past, while you know that neither you nor I, nor any of the living nations have yet been gathered together in the presence of the Judge.—With you the coming forth of some to “the res-

urrection of damnation,” is no damnation after the resurrection.

Why then should we do any thing more than state our opinions, with such reasons for them as we may think proper, and then leave the controversy?

To meet you, and my high church brethren, and all others who chose to assail me at every point, would require at least nine collateral lives in one man. My high church brethren belong to the same family with myself, and I feel free to handle them, therefore, with more severity than any one whom I regard as a stranger to the Christian community. I would argue with a Christian brother closely and pungently, and rebuke him sharply, if I saw there was need, while we walked side by side, and while each thought his side of the grand highway of holiness the nearest and the best to heaven; but were I attending some poor malefactor in his white frock and cap, trimmed in black, to the gallows, I should observe unusual tenderness in all my discourse, for fear of needlessly wounding his feelings, and preventing all good effects of the gospel which I might preach to him.

A brother might get good from a little friendly severity; but pity, compassion and the utmost tenderness of handling, belong to one who is under sentence of death, and on his way to the gallows, but so disordered in mind as not to know it.

You hold, it seems, to no future life and immortality, but what is consequent upon the resurrection of the dead; but I hold to the continued existence of a man's spirit when it goes out of his body at death, until the resurrection; and that independently of the resuscitation of the body the spirit of every man, once created, is according to the divine purpose as immortal and everlasting as himself. From your premises which are not true, you naturally enough infer that after death the rich man was not in torment, and that Lazarus was not in the blessed society of the faithful, because when they died they became nothing until new made at the future resurrection. My theory, however, happens to be that of the Bible and the Savior, that there is a spiritual existence of the soul of man between the dissolution of his body and the future, general resurrection; and according to this doctrine it was perfectly natural to talk of the righteous and the wicked immediately after death, as being happy or miserable; and to say, that some are “the spirits of the just made perfect,” while “the rich man also died, and was buried, and in hell lifted up his eyes, being in torments.”

You ask for proof, after I have given it repeatedly that in the immortal resurrection state there is a state, or hell of endless misery. I certify to you and all concerned again, that “when the Son of man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him,” and shall “sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations,” which event has not yet occurred, THEN “he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats,” and then “these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.” The punishment shall last as long as the life, for the duration of each is expressed by precisely the same word in the original language of our Savior.

Let me not, however, travel over the same ground twice in this amicable controversy. To your “TWISTIFICATION” of the account of the rich man and Lazarus I have already made all the reply which I think it deserves. No man would ever be absurd enough to adopt your explanation and perversion, had he not previously settled it in his own mind that there shall be no sinners in a future state of existence and suffering. Any sober critic will think a smile sufficient answer to all your labored endeavors to make the rich man to represent the Scribes and

Pharisees, and Lazarus publicans and sinners. You may summon Lightfoot and Hammond and Whibly to your aid, but after all I must tell you that your comment, to my mind, is quite as ridiculous as that of the spiritualizer of the Bible, who made three flocks of sheep lying by a well in the field, to denote the trinity; and the well to be the unity of the Deity; who when he came to his improvement of the discourse said, “behold, a well in the field—oh, my hearers, what a mercy it was that the field was not in the well, instead of the well in the field!” Gen. xxix, 2.

You refer me to a passage in 2 Thess. i, which I have already quoted from the 6th to the 10th verse, and wish that I should enter into a more full discussion with you concerning its application to the matter in dispute. To me the passage seemed so clear after all your attempts to heap difficulties upon it, that I thought further comment needless. I will, however, answer some of your questions on that text. You ask, “Who troubled the Thessalonians? for they were the persons to be punished in the manner stated.” I answer, “Somebody—some wicked persons; we do not certainly know who.” Whoever they were, they have been punished with destruction which will prove everlasting.—From your citation of Acts xvii, 5—9, you seem to think they were Jews. I think some of them may have been Jews, but that in general they were the countrymen of the Thessalonian Christians; for to “the Church of the Thessalonians” he says, 1 Thess. ii, 14, “ye also have suffered like things of your own countrymen,” which the churches in Judea have suffered from their unbelieving countrymen the Jews. This seems clearly to intimate that native Greeks of Thessalonica who never were at Judea, were the persons to be punished when the Lord should come.

At the time when Paul planted the gospel in Thessalonica he preached at first in the synagogue of the Jews, and when some of them believed, their unbelieving brethren the Jews, “moved with envy took unto them certain lewd fellows of the baser sort, and gathered a company, and set all the city in an uproar, and assaulted the house of Jason.” But besides some few Jews, of the devout Greeks a multitude believed, and were organized into a Christian church, “and of the chief women not a few.” Now when Paul, at a subsequent time, wrote to the Church of Thessalonica of the sufferings which they had endured, probably since he last visited them, there is no evidence that he referred principally to Jews; but rather much reason to conclude that the unbelieving Greeks were the principal persecutors, who were to be punished when Christ should come, not to Thessalonica, nor to Jerusalem, but to judge the world in righteousness. The time, moreover, when Christ should come to be glorified in his saints and to recompense tribulation to them who troubled pious Thessalonians is shown by 2 Thess. ii, to be subsequent to the erection and the destruction of the Papal man of sin. Paul cautions his readers not to think that the day of recompense of which he had been speaking was near at hand; for says he, *that day*, meaning the day when the Lord Jesus should be revealed from heaven in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God; “shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God.”—Now this papal son of perdition, who pretends to sit in the temple of God and show himself as an object of worship, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, was not revealed for several hundred years after Christ's coming judiciously by the Roman army to the destruction of Jerusalem.

* This date must be wrong, as it is the same of the last letter.

This shows that your attempt to make the time of our Savior's coming, "in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ," to be the time of Jerusalem's destruction, is perfectly futile.

You ask "when were they to be punished?" I answer, *when*, after the rise and fall of the papacy, the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels:—when he shall gather all nations before him, and shall divide the righteous from the wicked to consign the first to everlasting life, and the last to everlasting punishment, originally prepared for the devil and his angels.

Then they who have not received "the love of the truth, that they might be saved," and to whom for their love of lies, God has sent strong delusion, that they should believe a lie, shall be damned, with all who believed not the truth, but "had pleasure in unrighteousness." You ask, "Where shall they be punished?" I answer, wherever they are, or may be in a state of banishment from the blissful and gracious presence of the Lord. I answer, in hell, which is any and every place in which any one experiences unmingled and hopeless misery.

Finally you ask, "In what was the punishment to consist?" I answer in such tribulation as God shall recompense to them; in such vengeance as he shall take on them; in everlasting destruction from his presence, not from existence, because then their everlasting tribulation would be impossible; and in being excluded forever from the society of the saints who shall be glorified with their Redeemer.

All the passages of scripture which you have hitherto adduced in support of your utterly false and pernicious system, have received in my view ample attention.

Having thus spoken my sentiments freely and candidly, I shall not complain if you should employ equally strong language in giving your views of what I hold to be the solemn and awful truth of God concerning the endless damnation of the impenitently wicked. If I have taken my gloves off to write the present epistle, remember that you have invited me to make as free with you as with my High Church Presbyterian brethren, who with all their faults, are Christ's ministers still.

Yours, without one particle of unkind feeling, however I may seem severe.

EZRA STILES ELY.

To Mr. Ezra Stiles Ely.—Letter 16.

Philadelphia, Feb. 7, 1835.

Dear Sir—There is, in my judgment, a great want of candor and charity in many parts of your letter to which this is a reply. You say, that my "hope of future blessedness is founded in the belief that all mankind will be rendered happy, merely by being raised from the dead, and rendered immortal." Surely you cannot have either overlooked or forgotten my reiterated declaration, that mankind will be rendered happy hereafter by being *made alive in Christ*, in *incorruption, power, glory*; in a *spiritual body*, in the *image of the heavenly*. This is the express testimony of Divine Revelation; and as such I receive it in the love of the truth.

Your illustration and implied comparison of the "poor malefactor in his white frock and cap," savors as little of Christian charity as of courteous wit; and as I am willing to believe you penned it without due reflection, I will pass it by without farther remark.

In speaking of the *rich man and Lazarus*, you intimate that I deny your exposition, "because when they died they became nothing until new made in the resurrection." Surely you have not so carelessly perused my letter as to receive the impression, that I acknowledge the account in question to be a literal relation of facts. In my exposition of that subject, neither natural death, nor a resurrection into life, is so much as hinted at.

In reference to the same subject, you utter a sentence which might perhaps be returned to you with the alteration of one word—as follows:—"No man would ever be absurd

enough to adopt your exposition and perversion, had he not previously settled it in his own mind that there shall be some sinners in a future state of existence and suffering."

You seem to think that a smile is a sufficient answer to my scriptural exposition of the parable in question. Allow me to assure you, that as I was not *laughed into* that view of that subject, it is not probable I shall ever be *smiled out* of it. I have at least attempted to establish every point of my exposition by sacred Scripture; and it appears to me that your respect for the Bible, if not for your correspondent, should induce you to give serious attention to the matter. I should consider it as unbecoming in me to mourn over the prospective salvation of all our race, as it would be in you to crack a joke in view of endless damnation.

You denounce Universalism as an "utterly false and pernicious system," and you employ other offensive epithets in expression of your views and feelings. As I suppose you adopted this measure in order to satisfy your Presbyterian brethren that you are not going over to the Universalists, I will simply remark, that the letter before me will, in my judgment, be amply sufficient for that purpose; and I therefore hope you will strive to avoid all offensive language in future.

When I desired you to reason with your Universalist brethren as you do with your High School brethren in the Presbyterian Church, you surely could not have so misapprehended my meaning, as to suppose that I wished you to take off the gloves of Christian charity. I sincerely assure you, that I do not feel disposed to use as "strong language" to you as you have used to me. You are not ignorant of the fact, that your correspondent is not altogether unacquainted with the use of the two-edged sword of ridicule and satire—but he hereby re-assures you, that he prefers to wield the "sword of the spirit, which is the word of God." It is his humble desire and prayer, that in the last hour of his earthly pilgrimage he may enjoy the satisfaction of knowing, that in this discussion he has not written a line, or used an expression, which he could wish to erase.

Having thus briefly noticed a few incidental items of your letter, I shall proceed to examine whatever seems to have a bearing on the question in debate.

It appears you "have never prayed that Universalism may prove true." I think I may safely add, you have never prayed that it may prove false, however false you may believe it to be. Consequently, though you do not pray for Universalism, you do not pray against it. You are not *with us* in faith and preaching—and in this respect you are *against us*. Matt. xii, 30. But in the matter of prayer and desire, you "are on our part," Mark ix, 39—for "he that is not against us is for us," Luke ix, 50. And I am not without hope that you will yet cease to preach what you cannot pray for; and that you will then determine to proclaim the doctrine against which you cannot find it in your heart to pray. I must acknowledge, nevertheless, that if the final holiness and happiness of all mankind would, in your judgment, be so awful and pernicious a consummation as your language seems to intimate, I cannot see what there is to prevent you from praying against it.

Your incidental mention of the "unpardonable sin," as you choose to term it, comes too soon. My letter of Aug. 27, 1834, contained some important remarks on that subject, to which you have not yet deigned to reply.

You say, "I have never said that nothing but one expression or clause of Scripture prevents me from becoming a Universalist." You are aware, however, that in your letter of Aug. 27, 1834, you introduce the expression in Luke xx, "they which shall be accounted worthy"—and you add, "But for this clause, this text would render me a Universalist." In my reply, I endeavored to remove the obstacle referred to, by citing other Bible testimony on that point; and I have several times desired you to state wherein the argument failed to satisfy you—but you have hitherto allowed the matter to rest. I am really solicitous to hear from you on this subject—for if I can succeed in convincing you that the clause in question does not impair the force of the passage in proof of Universalism, you will of course "admit the doctrine, and construe all other passages of the Bible in consistency with it, or reject the whole."

The "far-fetched, inconsistent or absurd meaning," which I ascribe to the testimony by you adduced in proof of endless misery, happens to be stated in the language of the Bible. As to the "resurrection of damnation," by you mentioned, that matter is Scripturally explained in my letter of Aug. 27, 1834; and the events connected with the coming of the Son of man are particularly noticed in my

communications of May 9, and August 2, 1834. If you will re-peruse the latter, you will discover that the supposed transition of reference in Matt. xxiv, is therein largely considered; and you will also discover that your then only remaining argument in proof of said transition was swallowed up and destroyed by the express and positive testimony of our Lord.

But in the letter now before me you say, "Neither you nor I, nor any of the living nations, have yet been gathered together in the presence of the judge;" and hence you infer that the language, "before him shall be gathered ALL NATIONS," is still future in its reference. In reply, I need only repeat what I stated in former letters, that from the 4th to the 35th verse inclusive of Matt. xxiv, you apply to the period of the destruction of Jerusalem; that at verse 14 of said chapter Jesus declares that the gospel of the kingdom should be preached in "all the world for a witness to ALL NATIONS," previously to said destruction; and that in verse 30 he declares, that when he should come in his glory with his angels, (which you have admitted belongs to the period of the aforesaid destruction,) "ALL THE TRIBES of the earth" should mourn. Now, sir, if you can conceive how the gospel was preached "in ALL THE WORLD for a witness to ALL NATIONS," previously to the destruction of the Jewish polity; or how "ALL THE TRIBES of the earth" mourned when the sign of the coming of the Son of man appeared in heaven—you surely need not be at a loss to know how "ALL NATIONS" were gathered before him at the period of his coming. Your declaration that this "event has not yet occurred," is unsupported by scriptural authority. I affirm that Jesus declared it should occur before the close of the then existing generation, during the natural lifetime of some of his immediate disciples; and I have adduced his explicit prophecies in proof. Your statement that "in the immortal resurrection state, there is a state or hell of endless misery," is therefore groundless, so far as Matt. xxv is concerned; and the common-place remark that the words *everlasting and eternal*, in the last verse of that chapter, are the same in the original language of our Savior, is nothing to the purpose—for I deny that either the *eternal life* or *everlasting punishment* there mentioned, pertains to the future state. The judgment, in the prophetic relation of which those phrases occur, was to take place at the coming of the Son of man. See Matt. xvi, 27, 28. Compare Matt. xxiv, 29, 30 and xxv, 31. And as to the adjective *everlasting*, the Scripture writers apply it, as I have repeatedly stated, to the priesthood of Aaron, to the covenant of the law, and to many other things, which not only had no reference to the future state, but were temporary in their relations and character.

I am much pleased that you have at last, after four distinct and urgent solicitations, introduced and briefly commented on 2 Thess. i, 6—10. You stated in your letter of April 3, 1834, that in your opinion said passage is so "conclusive on the subject of our controversy," that it "must for ever prevent your becoming a Universalist."—Desiring our readers to remember these particulars, I proceed to notice your argument.

The persons to be punished as stated in verse 10, are mentioned in ver. 6. "Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you." No other persons than those who troubled the Thessalonian believers, had, or can have any part or lot in the matter of the punishment. It is true that those believers suffered much at the hands of some of their own countrymen—but it is plain that the unbelieving Jews at Thessalonica were the instigators thereof, as well as the principal persecutors in person.—This is obvious from Acts xvii, 5—9, and 1 Thess. i, 14—16.

In endeavoring to fix the time when, you assume that by "the man of sin" the Papacy is intended. This is altogether gratuitous. Paul speaks of "the mystery of iniquity" as being already at work when he wrote. He declares that the events by him spoken of should occur when the Lord Jesus should be revealed from heaven—when he should come. Luke xvii, 30, 31 is to the point. "Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed. IN THAT DAY, he which shall be upon the house top, and his stuff in the house, let him not come down to take it away; and he that is in the field, let him likewise not return back." Similar directions are given in Matt. xxiv, 15—18 and in Luke xxi, 20—23; in all which places the time of tribulation to Jerusalem is obviously referred to—"When he shall come." See Matt. x, 23, xvi, 27, 28, xxiv, 29, 30.

The persons signified by the word *and*, and the time

WHERE, being thus settled by the plain and unequivocal testimony of the Bible, only two questions remain. WHERE were they to be punished? You say, in *hell*—meaning a hell of misery in the future state. But Paul does not say so. He says, "who shall be punished from the presence of the Lord." David uses the following language: "Whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I make my bed in hell, thou art there." Psalm cxxxix, 7, 8. Cain went out from the presence of the Lord. Gen. iv, 16. Jonah rose up to flee unto Tarshish from the presence of the Lord. Jonah i, 3.

In solving this seeming difficulty, we should remember that in the phraseology of the Bible the presence of the Lord is frequently considered as something located. The Shekinah that dwelt between the cherubims which overshadowed the mercy seat of the altar, was under the old covenant specially considered the presence of the Lord. Hence said David, "Thou that dwellest between the cherubims, shine forth." Psalm lxxx, 1. The land of Judea, and particularly the temple, was by the Jews considered the place of God's peculiar presence. Jonah fled from the presence of the Lord unto Tarshish, where he supposed the presence of the Lord was not. And where he believed the presence of the Lord to be, we learn from chap. ii, 4, "I am cast out of thy sight; but I will look again toward thy holy temple." There dwelt the presence of the Lord, and there the glory of his power was displayed. And with these facts in view we readily perceive in what the punishment of the persons mentioned in 2 Thess. i, 6, consisted. It consisted in everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power—that is, in the overthrow of Jerusalem, the consequent destruction of the temple, and the ejection of the Jews from the land of Judea.

In confirmation of this statement, see 2 Kings xiii, 23:—"And the Lord was gracious unto them, and had compassion on them, because of his covenant with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and would not destroy them, neither cast them from his presence as yet."—This was spoken of the Jews. God speaks of destroying them, and of casting them from his presence. What he here says, that as yet he would not do to this people, in the following passage we find that he did. "For through the anger of the Lord, it came to pass in Jerusalem and Judah, until he had cast them out from his presence, that Zedekiah rebelled against the King of Babylon." 2 Kings xxiv, 20. The same is repeated Jeremiah lili, 3. During their seventy years captivity in Babylon, the Jews are said to have suffered destruction from the presence of the Lord.—Paul, in writing to the Thessalonians, speaks of the same people, and uses similar language in description of similar judgments.

But you will say, perhaps, that Paul speaks of "everlasting destruction." True—and Moses speaks of the everlasting covenant of the law, and of the everlasting priesthood of Aaron; and the land of Canaan was premised as an everlasting possession to the house of Israel. Besides, it is written, Jeremiah xxiii, 39, 40, "Therefore, behold, I, even I, will utterly forget you, and I will forsake you, and the city that I gave you and your fathers, and cast you out of my presence; and I will bring an everlasting reproach upon you, and a perpetual shame, which shall not be forgotten." This everlasting reproach and perpetual shame the Jewish people are now experiencing; and so also of the everlasting destruction mentioned by Paul.

In view of the question, "In what was the punishment to consist?" you say—"I answer, in such tribulation as God shall recompense to them; in such vengeance as he shall take on them." Very true; and in reference to the overthrow of Jerusalem, prior to the banishment of the Jews from Judea, it is written—"For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be." Matt. xxiv, 21. And in reference to the same period, we find the following record: "Then let them which be in Judea flee to the mountains . . . for these be the days of VENGEANCE; that all things which are written may be fulfilled . . . there shall be great distress in the land, and WRATH upon this people. And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles." Luke xxi, 20—24. Paul, in speaking of these events, says, in addressing the Thessalonians, "For the WRATH is come [rather, is coming—Nacknight, Hammond, and others,] upon them to the uttermost." 1 Thess. ii, 16.

I need not add any thing farther, at present, on the passage in question. You may perhaps assert that my Scriptural

exposition of the subject, is "strained, unnatural and ridiculous;" and perhaps you may deem a "smile" a sufficient reply to what I have written. Such procedure would undoubtedly excite some prejudice against your correspondent and against the doctrine of which he is an advocate, in the minds of some of our readers—but, in my judgment, an attempt on your part to overthrow my conclusions by Bible testimony, would more effectually subserve the interests of truth, and better comport with just ideas of controversial equity between man and man. Affectionately yours, &c.

ABEL C. THOMAS.

PHILADELPHIA.

We take pleasure in informing our readers generally, of the rapidly increasing interest which is manifested towards Universalism in the good city of "brotherly love." We say interest, for we very naturally conclude that people would not long continue to attend on the preaching of a sentiment, so much despised as that, without indulging some interest in it; and our churches there, have been literally thronged with hearers for some time. As we believe men will not listen to the teachings of the doctrine long, without imbibing some interest in it, so we equally believe that interest cannot remain stationary. With the serious inquirer it must advance, and he will not be long without an open acknowledgement of it. So that if men will but read and hear, we fear not the result. God grant that multitudes may continue to flock there, and patiently hear and weigh well what may be advanced in behalf of the despised doctrine, and compare it diligently with the Scriptures, to see whether "these things are indeed so."

It is no doubt to this increasing interest in our doctrine, and the numbers who attend our meetings, that we may attribute the alarm of some of Dr. Ely's "sage advisers." See article, "Reply to several Sage Advisers," with remarks, in another part of this paper. * They most earnestly desire "the more frequent opening of Presbyterian churches, on Sabbath and other evenings," to prevent "young people" from "running away to the Universalist meetings." It will be in vain for our Limitarian friends to "open" their churches to prevent people from "running to Universalist meetings," unless "a change comes o'er" their manner of preaching—unless they feed their hearers with "knowledge and understanding" instead of dealing out to them endless wrath and suffering.

We are not quite sure but that the Dr. may have had his mind on the same subject, and partook a little of the apprehensions of his "sage advisers," when he penned his letter to Br. Thomas, inserted in the present No. Certain it is, it is given in a different spirit from his usual course. Tho' it may all perhaps be in consequence of laying aside his "gloves."

Be this, however, as it may, we rejoice that the "young" or even "old" are disposed to run to our meetings. And we should be still more gratified to have the Doctor's "sage advisers" go themselves and hear, and judge, instead of teasing him with their apprehensions of his super-abounding charity towards Br. Thomas.

P.

* The article here alluded to, is necessarily omitted till next week. It sets forth that the Dr. is "pestered" with 3 or 4 classes of correspondents in relation to the Controversy and Universalism. One wants the Presbyterian churches opened to keep the youth from Universalist churches—another is afraid that the Dr. is going over to Universalism, &c. This last will explain the allusion in Br. Thomas' fifth paragraph, in his reply. We shall give the article next week.

DEDICATION.

A new and beautiful house of worship erected by the Universalists in Bridgewater, N. Y. was dedicated to the service of Almighty God on the 14th ult. Br. L. C. Brown was ordained to the work of the ministry on the same occasion. Dedication Sermon by Br. D. Skinner. Ordaining Sermon by Br. S. R. Smith. Brs. Potter, O. Roberts, Manley, and Woolley, likewise took part in the exercises. The Magazine and Advocate speaks of it as a most interesting occasion. Although the weather was very unpleasant, (raining,) the house was filled to overflowing at an early hour, and says the Magazine, "during the whole of the protracted services, there was not a foot of room in the gallery,

aisles or hall, unoccupied by the pressing, eager multitude, and many sleigh loads went away unable to get within doors." It must truly have been a refreshing and joyful season to the friends in Bridgewater and vicinity. But it is only a reiteration of similar glorious intelligence from almost every section of our country, for which we all should be doubly thankful.

P.

AN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.

We acknowledge the receipt of a kind note from a friend in Nazareth, Pa. with \$5 inclosed, for one year's papers—the balance as a donation. We tender the writer our warmest thanks for his kind feelings, and assure him that we "receive it in good part." If it is, as he thinks, "a small remuneration for the satisfaction he has enjoyed," it is valuable to us, as a pledge of friendship and good will. And he will now allow us to make a proposition in return. It is this:—If he knows within the circle of his acquaintance a destitute individual, who would be glad to read the Messenger, but has not the means of taking it, by forwarding us the name, residence, &c. we will most cheerfully forward the paper to the amount of the above balance; and by this means he may make glad the heart of more than one. Or, perhaps, some candid and opposing friend may like to hear and see what can be said in defence of the doctrine "every where spoken against," though he may not have so far dismissed his fears as to venture to subscribe for a Universalist periodical. Shall we hear from him?

P.

* * We were in error in our last, in attributing the article, "Harp of the Mind," to the Child's Universalist Gazette. We find on examination that we had before inserted it, and that it originally appeared in the Rural Repository, an excellent paper, published at Hudson N. Y. We thought at first, we had seen the article, but finding it in the Gazette, with initials attached, and under equal appearance of originality with any of the articles therein, we concluded we must be mistaken.

A JUDGEMENT IN ETERNITY.

We have just received at our New-York office, (2 Chatham-Square,) a large supply of a 12 mo. pamphlet, of 28 pages, entitled "Proofs of a Judgment in Eternity. A Sermon delivered in the Kensington brick Methodist Meeting House, Philadelphia, Sunday Evening, Jan. 4, 1835. By William A. Wiggins, Pastor. Taken in Short Hand. With a Review of the Argument, by Abel C. Thomas." It will not be proper for us to speak of the merits of the Review, from the connexion of the author with our columns. Readers will judge for themselves, and for this purpose we invite special attention to the pamphlet, which may be had Wholesale and Retail at this office.

P.

* * Br. F. Hitchcock desires all letters, papers, &c. intended for him, to be addressed to him at Danbury, Conn. until farther notice.

Died,

In New-York on the 2d instant, ELIZA, wife of John Pierson, aged 38. Her remains were conveyed to Kingsbridge for interment.

Religious Notices.

Br. Hallock's engagements are such that it is impossible for him to preach at Newark on Sabbath next. (to-morrow,) as the friends desired.

Br. Hitchcock will preach in Newark the 2d Sabbath in March, and at Rahway on the 3d Sabbath.

EASTERS.

There is a flower, a holy one,
That blossoms on my path,
No need of dew or daily sun,
Or falling showers it hath;
It blooms as brightly on the storm,
As on the cloudless day,
And rears unharmed its humble form,
When others fade away.

That plant is Faith; its holy leaves
Reviving odors shed
Upon the lowly place of grief,
Or mansions of the dead.
God is its sun; his living light
In happy hours he lends,
And silently in sorrow's night
Religion's dew descends.

Plant of my soul, be fading things,
By other hands cared,
But through life's weary wanderings,
I'll bear thee in my breast;
And when the icy power shall chill
The fountains of my breath;
Thy loveliness shall cheer me still
E'en in the hour of death.

FUNERAL CEREMONIES OF THE ARABS.

The Arabs, who set little value on the lives of mankind, respect their remains, and take the utmost care of their interments; the want of it they consider one of the greatest misfortunes that can happen, and they die with composure when they are certain of leaving some one behind them to bury them. The severest punishment, therefore, among them is to be cut to pieces and thrown to the dogs. Their funeral ceremonies, as far as I have had an opportunity to observe them, are as follows:—Scarcely has the Arab breathed his last, when his body is carefully washed; after which it is wrapped up in a winding-sheet of white cloth, reserved by the Arabs for that purpose. This cloth is manufactured in the town of Arabia; but they set a much higher value upon that which is brought them by pilgrims from Mecca, and which has been blessed by the principal Iman. This benediction is expensive, it is true; but the singular favors annexed to it make them forget what it costs. As soon as the dead body is purified, it is laid upon a kind of litter, and is carried to the place of interment, either on horseback, or by the friends and relations of the deceased. While the men are employed in digging the grave, the women squat down in a circle around the body, which they feel and uncover, and afterwards converse together with much indifference; but every now and then they break off their discourse, to give vent to their lamentations, to ask the body questions, to beseech it, in the most earnest manner, to return again, and take up its abode amongst them. "Why," say they, "hast thou quitted us? Did we not prepare thy *courcouson* well? Alas! shall thy children behold thee no more? At present, since thou hast plunged them into sadness and wo, nothing remains for them but to sigh and to weep. Ah! return again with us; nothing shall be wanting to thee. But thou hearest us no more; thou no longer givest us an answer to our words; thou hearest only our sighs," &c. and other expressions of the same kind, which I have often made the Arabs translate to me, whilst I was assisting at these mournful ceremonies. These dismal lamentations, which display a natural and pathetic eloquence, would have a powerful effect in moving the hearts of the spectators, did they not see these very women, a moment after, throw aside that external appearance of the deepest grief, talk and laugh together, and afterwards return to their former wailings. During these tender complaints, they tear their hair, and open the veins of their temples with their nails, while the blood trickles down mingled with their tears, and exhibits an appearance of the deepest despair. When the grave is finished, the body is deposited in it on its side, with the face turned towards the east. One of

their *papas* puts into his hand a letter of recommendation to Mahomet; after which a kind of arch is formed over it with branches of trees, in order that the earth may not touch it. When the grave is covered with earth, other branches of trees are laid over it, with a quantity of large stones, to prevent savage animals from devouring the body in the night time. In the middle of the stones, an opening is left where they deposit earthen vessels, and other family utensils;—but this is only done to Arabs of a certain rank. Before they quit the grave, they erect in the middle of it a kind of funeral flag, which is generally a piece of the clothes of the deceased, fixed to the end of a stick. When the ceremony is finished, each returns home with the greatest tranquility, and without showing, in their exterior appearance, any signs of the melancholy duty they had been discharging. The nearest relations and friends of the deceased go, from time to time, and visit his tomb. They remove some stones from it, and in part uncover the body, to see that the person has not returned to life; and when the smell convinces them of the contrary, they renew their wailings and lamentations as above described. Some scatter a little lime over the stones, to make the tomb somewhat brighter. On every holiday the Arabs go in crowds to visit the tombs of their dead, and to bedew them with their tears.—*Poiret's Travels.*

MOUNTAIN SCENERY.

There is something in the wildness and sublimity of mountain scenery, that tends to remind us rather of eternity than decay. The perishable works of man are no where to be seen. No city lies in gloomy ruins, to show the outlines of its faded greatness—no remnant of a sanctuary here stands to show the worship that has passed away. We see no falling record of the glorious deeds of those whose names are learnt on history's page. We stand upon the mountain, and we scarcely know that man exists upon the earth. This is not the land where arts have died or science been forgot—these rocks never echoed the eloquence of orators, or the song of the poets—these waters never bore the proud ship of the merchant—this soil never yielded to man the fruits of his industry. It is not here that the finger of time can be recognized. In vain would he set his mark on snows that never melt, or disturb the fast-bound form of adamant ice. In vain he stretches his hand where the rushing torrent, and the waving waterfall, blest with the eternity of youth, dash on their headlong course, regardless of the blighting power that withers strength, or lulls to rest the creations and the creatures of mortality.

Here we may pause, and say that time has lost its power. Here we may view the faint efforts of time overthrown in an instant. Changes there are: but the work of an hour has defeated the slow progress of decay. The lightning of the thunder storm—the blowing tempest—the engulfing flood—the overspreading avalanche—have effaced from the surface of nature the impress of time, and left nought in the change to remind us of age. Surely there are scenes in life which seem created to awaken in mankind the recollection, that even time can lose its power. Who will not feel the nothingness of the pleasures—the cares—nay, even the sorrows of our petty span, when for a moment, he dwells with his heart and soul upon the thoughts of an eternity! Yes it will sober the gay—it will comfort the grieved.

NIGHT.

Silent and solemn night! thou art ever sacred to my feelings!—thou art the benefactress of the afflicted, whose tears thou driest up—thou art the friend of the unfortunate, whose sorrows are forgotten in thy gentle dreams! thou art

the mother of the weary who sink to repose in thy arms, and receive from thee new life and vigor—thou art an evidence of the majestic and power of God—of his unfathomable wisdom and ineffable goodness!

Where is the man that remains unmoved when he walks forth in the solitary night, and beholds innumerable worlds spread out before him?—when the stillness of death reigns in the streets which, but a few hours before, were alive with the throng and bustle of the crowd? when the gardens and groves, and habitations of men are silent? when the trees and the flowers are enveloped in darkness, or seen in the pale and glimmering light of the moon? *

How insignificant would the earth appear did she not receive a charm from the splendor of the midnight heavens! Where is the prowess of the mighty chief, when weariness comes upon him, and he is bound in the arms of sleep! What the riches of the earth when their possessor, like one that is dead, slumbers unconscious of them all.

Universalist Books,

Which may be obtained of A. C. Thomas, 132 Chestnut-street Philadelphia.

- Balfour's First Inquiry—being a faithful examination of all the passages in the Bible in which the word Hell occurs—\$1.
Balfour's Second Inquiry—being an examination of the Scriptural doctrine concerning the devil, and the import of the words translated everlasting, eternal, forever, &c.—\$1.
Balfour's Essays on the state of the dead, and inquiries into the meaning of the words judge, damn, condemn, and their derivatives—\$1.
Balfour's Examination of Stuart's Exegetical Essays—75 cts.
Balfour's Letters to Professor Stuart—25 cts. In this work the author has shown that his conversion to Universalism is mainly attributable to the Professor's criticisms on portions of the Bible.
Balfour's Letter in Reply to Dr. Allen's Lecture against Universal Salvation—25 cts.
Balfour's Letter to Whi man in defence of so much of the First Inquiry as pertains to the term Gehenna—25 cts.
Ballou's Treatise on Atonement—an invaluable work, being an inquiry into the origin, nature and effects of sin, and of the consequences of the Atonement—50 cts.
Ballou's Notes in illustration of the Parables—75 cts.
Ballou's XXVI Lectures on important doctrines—\$1.
Ballou's XXV Select Sermons on various subjects—\$1.
Ballou's XI Sermons delivered in Philadelphia—37 cts.
Ballou's Examination of the doctrine of future Punishment—50 cts.
Ancient History of Universalism, by H. Ballou 2d.—\$1.
Modern History of Universalism, by T. Whittemore—\$1.
T. Southwood Smith's Treatise on the Divine Government—a work I would not be without for five times the price—75 cts.
Notes and Illustrations of the Parables, by Thomas Whittemore—an admirable and very useful volume—75 cts.
Paige's Selections from Eminent Commentators, showing that the most eminent Partialist critics justify the Universalist's interpretations of nearly every prominent passage in the New Testament—\$1.
Life of John Murray—Whittemore's much improved edition, 50 cts.—do. Marsh, Capen and Lyon's, 46 cts—also an edition at 37 cts.
Winchester's Dialogues on Universal Restoration—63 cts.
R. Streeter's Familiar Conversations on the doctrine and tendency of Universalism—a fine work—50 cts.
Streeter's News from Three Worlds—25 cts.
Universalist Expositor—critical and explanatory—3 volumes \$2, 50 each.
Dolphus Skinner's Letters to Drs. Aikin and Lansing—50 cts.
Eternal Hell Torments Overthrown—37 cts.
Pitt Morse's Review of Parker's Lectures against the doctrine of Universal Salvation.
David Pickering's Lectures in proof of Divine Revelation—a subject to which Christians do not sufficiently attend—75 cts.
Letters on Revelation between Ballou and Kneeland—50 cts.
Streeter's New Universalist Hymn Book—50 cts.
Discussion at Danvers between Whittemore and Brahma—25 cts.
Christian Visitant—a very useful and interesting work, in two volumes—25 cts. each.
Reply to Hawes' Reasons for not embracing Universalism—13 cts.

Most of the above Books are for Sale, Wholesale and Retail, at No. 3 Chatham-square, foot of Bowery, New-York.

The Prize Tale.

We have just published at this office, in Pamphlet form, the Prize Tale inserted in No. 1 of this vol. \$2 50 per 100 37 1-2 cents per doz. Orders solicited.